

Migration and development models in Dobroudja, 1880-1913: contribution to the study of the topic

Șerban, Stelu

Veröffentlichungsversion / Published Version
Zeitschriftenartikel / journal article

Empfohlene Zitierung / Suggested Citation:

Șerban, S. (2009). Migration and development models in Dobroudja, 1880-1913: contribution to the study of the topic. *Studia Politica: Romanian Political Science Review*, 9(4), 609-620. <https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:0168-ssoar-445377>

Nutzungsbedingungen:

Dieser Text wird unter einer CC BY-NC-ND Lizenz (Namensnennung-Nicht-kommerziell-Keine Bearbeitung) zur Verfügung gestellt. Nähere Auskünfte zu den CC-Lizenzen finden Sie hier:
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/deed.de>

Terms of use:

This document is made available under a CC BY-NC-ND Licence (Attribution-Non Commercial-NoDerivatives). For more information see:
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0>

Migration and Development Models in Dobroudja, 1880-1913

Contribution to the Study of the Topic

STELU ȘERBAN

The modernization of the traditional societies is a similar process in almost all the European area. There are still strong discrepancies because of the initial situation of the national societies, as well as the different accents between the European countries. What is more, the modernization inside each country generated socio-economic and cultural tensions, which increased by the sudden constraint of the the *mass politics* distorted the definition and approach of the modernization problems. The main cause for this state is the acceptance of the homogenous nation model as a fundamental landmark of modernization. In most of the cases the traditional society already on its way to the organic modernization, rejected the model of the homogenous nation. This way its structures were oriented on the basis of the adaptation to the immediate socio-historical contexts, than followed the abstract purposes of development under the umbrella of the political nation.

Come inside the Romanian state in 1878, only 12 years after 1866, the year when the Romanian Principalities decisively stepped on the way of political and economic modernization of western model, Dobroudja¹ represents an extreme revealer of the problems and conflicts of this modernizing programme². It is significant that at the Berlin Congress in 1878 the Romanian delegation has been replaced the discussions of the ethnic issues with the programme for the economic development. Although at the negotiation the representatives of the Romanian Principalities defended the cause of Bessarabia, with a dominant Romanian population, the problem of the Romanian population in Timok Valley (Bulgaria and Serbia) was not in the attention of the authorities from Bucharest. It was approached by the Romanian diplomacy much later under the circumstances of the two Balkan wars³. In 1878 they preferred to integrate Dobroudja, a province where the Romanian population was outnumbered by the Slavs (Bulgarian, Russians, Lippovans) or Moslems (Turks, Tartars)⁴, a solution which had ample economic consequences.

¹ Let's say that all over this material we refer to the present part of Dobroudja from Romania. At South Dobroudja, the Cadrilater, which is in Bulgaria, we refer rarely and in examples (see the monograph of Ezibei village made by C.D. Mircești at the end of the interwar period). We have to say that a comparative study of social history between the two areas would be extremely fertile and would bring to light new dimensions of both cases.

² Catherine DURANDIN, *Discurs politic și modernizare în România, secolele XIX-XX*, Romanian transl. by Toader Nicoară, Presa Universitară Clujeană. Cluj-Napoca, 2001, pp. 99-110.

³ Ștefan VÂLCU, "Românii uitați: o introducere în chestia timoceană", *Buletinul Institutului de Studii Sud Est Europene*, IX-A, 1998, pp. 98-110/p. 100 ff.

⁴ In written works, under doubtful circumstances, Bulgarian authors doubt the intentions of the Romanian diplomacy of keeping Dobroudja inside the Romanian state. In their opinion Dobroudja was only a solution for the transition (Milan G. MARKOFF, *The Political Lost of Dobroudja after the Berliner Congress*, Lausanne, 1918).

The economic stake of this decision was seen in the next years. We will try to trace its principles and premises as follows.

Models of Development in Dobroudja between 1878 and 1910

The economic potential of Dobroudja was seen clearly before the half of the 19th century. The first monography of the area is contemporary with the age of *Tanzimat*, period whose ideas affected all the south-eastern European area¹. More over, the author of this monography, Ion Ionescu dela Brad², was a controversial and refractory personality, the fan of the principles of social changing through reforms, which sometimes reached the limits of an utopia³.

Together with the interest of the Ottoman administration we have to remember some attempts of Moldavian and Wallachian boyars in the middle of the 19th century⁴. It is about two plans of granting some parts of Dobroudja by the Ottoman administration. The first brought together six Moldavian and Wallachian boyars who would have liked the establishing of some "principauté indépendante" in the area of the former village Carasu, distroyed in the war between 1828-1829. All the Romanians from Dobroudja, as well as the participants at the revolution in 1848, followed by the repression would have settled on its edges. The project was not finalised.

The second attempt belonged to Ion Ghica. Couniled by Ionescu de la Brad, Ghica wanted to establish a model farm and an agriculture school, in the area of the present village Topalu. A consortium of six share holders was created, to which the Turkish part participated, with private persons and representatives of

¹ Stevan K. PAVLOWITCH, *A History of the Balkans, 1804-1945*, Addison Wesley Longman Limited, Essex, 1999, pp. 64-68.

² The monograph to which we refer appeared in French in 1850 under the title *Excursion agricole dans la plaine de Dobrodja*, Paris. For the present work we use the translation in Romanian found in Ion IONESCU DE LA BRAD, *Opere*, vol. II, București, 1944, pp. 81-121. We must precise that the author refers to a Dobroudja lying from Varna to the Danube Delta, including the Cadrilater.

³ Ion Ionescu dela Brad studied Agronomy in France (at Roville, as it is written on the back cover of his monography about Dobroudja). In 1848 he conducted the works of the Property Commission from the temporary government installed as a result of the revolution in Wallachia. When the revolution was defeated, he hired as a councillor on economic problems of the pashalic in Tesalia. Under this quality he will elaborate more works having as an immediate purpose the economic development of some regions from the Ottoman Empire (Dobroudja, Tessaly and Asia Minor). In 1860, having written some critical articles to the government he was given forced domicile at Neamț Monastery in Moldavia. He came back to politics in 1866 and activated for two decades, dedicating a part of his time to the elaboration of an excellent county monographies. He wanted to put his ideas into practice by settling a model farm on a property he bought in Moldavia. Henri H. Stahl emphasizes his place in the social history of Romania (Henri H. STAHL, *Gânditori și curente de istorie socială românească*, Editura Universității București, București, 2001, pp. 163-166). The figure of Ionescu de la Brad is still popular in the area of the villages Prăjești, Negri and Brad, Bacău, within the Roman Catholic population (personal observation, made in the summer of the year 2002 on the occasion of a field research in the area).

⁴ Tudor MATEESCU, "Projets roumains d'exploitation agricole en Dobroudja au milieu de XIX^e siècle", *Revue Roumaine d'Histoire*, XI, no. 4, 1972, pp. 655-663/p. 656 ff.

the administration. Among the Romanians, together with Ion Ghica, were Vasile Alecsandri, C. Negri and Gr. Al. Ghica, the last ruler of Moldavia. The plan supposed the construction of a terrestrial line of communication between Cernavodă and Constanța as a prolonging of the natural link on the Danube. At the beginning of the year 1851 the project was abandoned. Meanwhile Ionescu de la Brad hired as a councillor of the visir of Tesalia, at the invitation of the Ottoman ministry of agriculture.

These attempts were contemporary with the extremely interesting research of Ion Ionescu de la Brad, as a result of which we have his well known monography. He also called Dobroudja the California of Romania¹, which proves that his interest for Dobroudja was high above the situations. If we limit to the quoted work, we have to notice that de la Brad wanted for the economic future of Dobroudja mainly the development of the transportation network, terrestrial and fluvial, from the east to the west, so that we could valour the opening at the Black Sea.

From the point of view of the goods production his proposals were less revolutionary. He noticed the good quality of the soil, but also the lack of water sources. He also noticed that even if Dobroudja could offer the existence of 2 million people, there were only 60 000 who lived on its edges at the time². He proposed the colonization of the province in such a way that the extra soil could be exploited. In the way of organising such an agricultural regime, he thought that the practices of the local economy should be taken into account, especially the balance between agriculture and cattle breeding³.

We went through all these projects because after 1878 a big part of their ideas will serve as a basis for the elaboration of a legislation that changed profoundly Dobroudja economic and social structure. We notice, in the first place, the Law of Organization of Dobroudja (1880) and the one regarding the reglementation of land property (1882). Different interests lay at the basis of this laws⁴. It was first, an economic interest. The development of the labour capital and the transportation network was followed, as well as the diking in of the Danube Delta, and the transformation of Constanța in a free area (*porto-franco*). In close relation with the economic programme was the "national interest", with Vasile Kogălniceanu's expression, which meant the colonization of Dobroudja. The effects of these two directions of action were canalized, at least in the authorities intention, by the political interest which imposed that all the people of Dobroudja, "Romanian and non Romanian" (V. Kogălniceanu) to enjoy "freedom and political rights".

Depending on the balance of the political forces in the capital of the country, each of these interests was prior. The liberals, for instance considered the economic interest more important. Ion I. Nacian was preoccupied with the costs of the colonization of Dobroudja and with the strictly economic efficiency of such an action⁵. In his opinion, since the local society did not have enough resources, the

¹ Ion IONESCU DE LA BRAD, *Opere*, vol. II, cit., p. 657.

² *Ibidem*, p. 101.

³ *Ibidem*, p. 108.

⁴ Vasile M. KOGĂLNICEANU, *Dobrogea 1879-1909. Drepturi politice fără libertăți*, Socex, București, 1910, p. 263.

⁵ I.I. NACIAN, *La Dobroudja economique et sociale*, Paris, 1886; IDEM, *Dobrogea. Reformele economice și sociale ce ea reclamă*, București, 1892.

state should have taken the initiative of the social and economic development of Dobroudja. This way, on a long term, the province would become a source of incomes for the public budget (through the state domains, the state enterprises, and the tax collecting)¹. In Nacian's ideas we can see the influence of the modernization model of the Romanian liberals of the time. Among these, we remember the centralization of the political decision, the direct intervention of the state and the rapid development of the economy.

The neglecting of the liberal government of the political aspect, "the political interest" (V.M. Kogălniceanu), in the matter of Dobroudja, led to a paradoxical situation. Almost three decades the political and civic rights of the inhabitants of Dobroudja were cut off. Thus, the limitation of exercising of these rights, which was initially meant as a temporary situation lasted until 1909, when, by a special law, the Law to giving political rights to the people in Constanța and Tulcea counties, was established the right to have representatives in the two Chambers of the Romanian Parliament, as well as the right to choose them under the limits of the censitary electoral regime of the time. We will refer to this matter further. Here we notice only that at the beginning the local weakly structured elite matured and raised a political opposition towards the authoritarian centralism of the regime from Bucharest. Among the members of this opposition there were personalities with a moderate conservative orientation, such as Vasile M. Kogălniceanu or Ioan Bănescu, as well as local leaders without political commitments but with functions in the local councils, such as Ioan N. Roman.

Vasile M. Kogălniceanu describes this situation like this:

"The allmightiness of the administration is strengthened through the new methods of 'energetic' nationalization. The prefect (the government's representative – o.n.) reaches everything. Needing new powers in order to put down the dangerous aspirations of the 'foreigners' in Dobroudja, the governments from Bucharest give them gladly. All over the place come foreigners to smother every initiative and independence of the elective councils, no matter if they are communal or county. The so-called national politics covers everything"².

Kogălniceanu says that

"with the help of the intellectuals...as well as of the Romanians settled there the local society organized the opposition against this pressure...They typed newspapers. They wrote leaflets and books, they organized protest delegations and worked for the idea of emancipation"³.

¹ Nacian anticipated a situation which was already a reality at the beginning of the 1900. Thus I.N. Roman, a powerful local personality, in a work published in 1905 shows that Dobroudja was massively plundered through the fiscal policies. He notes that in the financial year 1902-1903, while the sums earned by the state in Dobroudja were of 13 474 724 lei, the budgetary allocations for this province hardly reached 4 969 036. The surplus remained in Bucharest under the conditions in which "almost all the schools and churches in Dobroudja are built by the local people" and some vital necessities, the diking in of the pools, the construction of the railway Constanța- Tulcea, were ignored (Ioan N. ROMAN, *Dobrogea și drepturile politice ale locuitorilor ei*, Constanța, 1905, p. 88).

² Vasile M. KOGĂLNICEANU, *Dobrogea 1879-1909...cit.*, pp. 209-210.

³ *Ibidem*, p. 211.

Kogălniceanu, who had big properties in Tuzla¹, led press campaigns in *Steaua Dunării* and *Agrarul* publications and presented interpellations as a deputy of the Parliament in Bucharest².

Topics of Maximum Divergence

We were saying earlier that there was a certain competition for influence among the representatives of the central power in Bucharest and the local personalities supported by groups of interest in full development. After the Law of Organization of Dobroudja in 1880, which was only a juridical frame, being also called "The Constitution of Dobroudja", followed the Law about real estate properties, in 1882, which was the first confrontation between the divergent interests and ideas. That was why it was modified many times, in 1884, 1885, 1889, 1893 and, the last time in 1909³. The cause were the abuses the new owners made benefiting the intricacies of the law. Thus the area that could become a property and at the beginning of the 1900s decreased from 100 ha to 10 ha and the people who did not have the housing in Dobroudja or did not pay the state the value established for the property started being dispossessed⁴. It seems that the Romanian state had a strictly fiscal interest regarding the reglementation of the land property.

The taking over of the juridical state of the land property from the Ottoman administration was not an easy problem to solve. V.M. Kogălniceanu points the four main measures taken by the law in 1882⁵: I) the recognition of the absolute property, *mulk*, inherited before 1878, and whose owners were the religious settlements and the public interest institutions; II) the buying back of the usufruct property, *mirî*, which in fact represented the largest part of the land property in Dobroudja (the buying back was made by the Romanian state, by giving one third of the surface owned as "mirie"); III) the centralization of the lands left by the emigrants, mostly Turks, who had "ciflik" type exploitations; IV) the centralization and exploitation of the lands owned by the state (pools, quarries, mines).

The problem of the Romanian citizenship was closely linked to the one of the property. Although the Law of Dobroudja organization in 1880 stated in art. 3 that: "The inhabitants of Dobroudja, who became Romanian citizens, are equal in front of the law, enjoy all the citizen rights, and can be named in public functions, no matter their origin or religion"⁶, regarding the political rights, the law that stated this principle clearly was issued in 1909. During the period between these dates the term of "Dobroudjan citizenship" was used, and it represented an ensemble of

¹ See further Kogălniceanu, who defined himself as an "agriculturist". He brought an important contribution to define and solve the agrarian problem in that period (Henri H. STAHL, *Gânditori și curente...cit.*, p. 180; Valeriu BULGARU, *Reforma agrară din 1921. Fundamente economice*, Editura de Vest, Timișoara, 2003, p. 20).

² The liberals did not let these campaigns unanswered. Around the 1900s Scarlat Vârnav, the prefect of Constanța wrote several leaflets and a very good "general situation" of the county (Scarlat VÂRNAV, *Situațiunea generală a județului Constanța la începutul anului 1903*, Constanța, 1904).

³ Constantin N. SARRY, *Chestiunea proprietății din Dobrogea*, București, 1910.

⁴ *Ibidem*, pp. 11-16; Ioan N. ROMAN, *Dobrogea și drepturile politice...cit.*, pp. 98-99.

⁵ Vasile M. KOGĂLNICEANU, *Dobrogea 1879-1909...cit.*, p. 166.

⁶ *Ibidem*, p. 124.

heterogeneous civil categories with serious limitations of the constitutional rights. This way because of the reason of the maintaining of the political stability and of the "full assimilation of Dobroudja with Romania"¹, the inhabitants of Dobroudja had only the right to vote and to be represented in the local councils². The mayors were named by the prefects, who were named by the government from Bucharest. As we said, the Dobroudjans did not have the right to representation or to vote at the level of the central power and many of their civil rights (the free association, the expressing of the personal opinion) were limited.

Regarding the heterogeneity of the civil categories of the period, I.N. Roman, for example, mentions four categories of "Romanian citizens": I) come in Dobroudja after April 11 1877 from the left of the Danube as Romanian citizens; II) all the Ottoman subjects who became Romanian citizens before this date; III) Romanian ethnics, come from the provinces outside the Romanian State (from Ardeal, Bucovina, Basarabia) who, according to article 9 of the Constitution needed to be recognized by the Romanian state (they had already bought land in Dobroudja) and IV) agricultors of a different origin (Germans, Lipovans, Bulgarians etc.) established between 1877, April, 11 and 1882, April, 3 (when the real estate property law was adopted)³.

In this last context it is easy to think that the problem of granting the Romanian citizenship was an extremely sensitive subject for the authorities in Bucharest. The different constraints that were pressing this politics were illustrated by two situations. First it is about granting the Romanian citizenship to the people in Ardeal who were shepherds (they went with the sheep in Dobroudja in winter, in their places of origin in summer, usually in the south of Transylvania) and had the opportunity to buy land and to settle in the places of the old sheep folds. Juridically, they were citizens of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, that was why they had some restrictions in buying land and having the possession recognised. That was why there were campaigns regarding the relaxing of the conditions of granting the citizenship, of which benefitted the other ethnies (especially the Germans). The data and intensity of this process remain to be established in some further research. A second significant situation is that of the people of other ethnies who indirectly recognized the authority of the Romanian State. It is about demands to the Romanian state addressed by members of the Reformed communities to be given Romanian passports to travel in Transylvania. The purpose of these trips was to collect funds for the community to build new prayer houses in regions in Dobroudja where there lived Protestant people. The same community addressed many demands to the local authorities (prefect's office) to be given construction land, or to sell them land preferentially (the case of Caramurat commune, today Mihail Kogălniceanu).

Demographic and Land Property Transformations

The political projects of administration and development of Dobroudja did not miss, either the interests and commitments regarding one of these projects. Did they have thorough effects at the level of the local society? And if they did what were the effects?

¹ *Ibidem*, p. 115.

² Ioan N. ROMAN, *Dobrogea și drepturile politice...cit.*, p. 28 ff.

³ *Ibidem*, pp. 71-72.

One of the most visible effects of the new status of Dobroudja is the demographic change which had as a cause the migratory phenomenon. The starting point is the situation of the population, which, fortunately, was researched by Ionescu in 1850 (Table 1 in the Annexes).

We think that a brief comment on the situation in the Table 1 is useful. First we notice that the province was ethnically diverse in that period. If the Romanians were superior on number in Tulcea, Isaccea and Măcin areas, they were not in Mangalia, Balcic and Bazargic. Baba was the most balanced ethnically. We also have to show the extreme diversity of the sizes of the villages (Table 2 in the Annexes). If the average was about forty families per village all over the province, it differs a lot from *caza* to *caza*. In Tulcea, which was majoritary Romanian, a village had about 329 families, while in Mangalia and Balcic, *caza*-s with mostly Turkish population, the average was about 11, respectively 13 families per village.

On a long term perspective this situation can be compared with the data of two general censuses of Romania: the census of the population in 1899 and published by Leonida Colescu in 1905, and the general census of the population in 1930 published since 1938 and coordinated by Sabin Manuilă. Although before 1899 there were attempts of taking the census of the population of Romania (1884, 1889, 1894), an authorized source, Leonida Colescu, contests the valability of the data. It must also be said that the census coordinated by him (1899) lacks information about the ethnic belonging of Romania's population. Among the indicators of this situation, we can only find citizenship and religion. Not always did they overlap with the ethnic belonging (there is no data about the mother tongue), although L. Colescu starts from the premises that almost all the Romanian citizens are Romanian ethnically. As a result, the numbers referring to this last situation are aproximative.

Certain data are offered by the census in 1930. In Constanța at that date there was a population of 253 093 persons whose belonging was as follows: 66.2% Romanian, 8.9% Bulgarian, 6.8% Turks, 6% Tartars, 3.8% Germans, 1.8% Greeks, 1.5% Russians, 1.3% Armenians (the rest of the nationalities had below 1%). From the point of view of the residence, 67.5% of the total of the population lived in villages¹. The overlapping of the residence and ethnic belonging indicators give us the following situation:

- The Romanians showed a slight preference for the urban area (68.7% in towns, with two and a half percent more than the general percentage of 66.2%), the Russians (1.7% to 1.5%), the Turks (7.3% to 6.8%).
- This tendency was more emphasized with the Greeks (5.2% to 1.8%), the Armenians (3.9% to 1.3%), the Jews (2.2% to 0.7%) and the Hungarians (1.7 to 0.6%).
- Opposite tendencies, a strong preference to the rural area was showed by the Bulgarians (2% in towns to 8.9% totally) and the Tartars (2% to 6% totally).
- A special place was held by the Germans who lived mostly in the rural area (2.5% in towns to 3.8% totally). The community of the Dobroudjan Germans had a slightly different evolution towards that of the other ethnies, despite its reduced percentage in that period (1900-1930) playing a main role in the social development of the area². We have to remember that the Germans were the only important nationality in Constanța confesionally divided in Protestants and Roman-Catholics.

¹ We also have to remember that the Organization Law of Administration in 1925 did not have clear criteria of clasifying the localities in towns and villages, from where appeared justified criticism even at that period.

² See further the cases of the villages from Tuzla, Sarighiol, Cogea, the case of the German school in Constanța as well as the article about the oral histories in Nicolae Bălcescu village, ex

The above situation shows that in the context of the migratory flux which changed the social structure of Dobroudja in that period the nationalities who participated at this process had different orientations and preferences. We will detail this thesis by giving as examples concrete cases. The clues about the greatness of these migrations come from the comparison of the data of this census with the data of that in 1899. In 1899 in Constanța there lived 141 056 inhabitants, which represents only 56% of the population in 1930. If we compare to the year 1884, when in Constanța lived 88 151 inhabitants we can say that between 1884-1930, the population of the county almost tripled. A part of this extra population comes from the natural raising (the excedent of births to deaths). The same L. Colescu, specifying that the two counties of Dobroudja at that time, Constanța and Tulcea, had the biggest excedent of the kind among other counties in Romania, gives figures about the excedent of births in the years 1897-1901. For Constanța the figures are: 1677 (in 1897), 2178 (1898), 2321 (1899), 2542 (1900), 2618 (1901). We have to add that the infant mortality was extremely high. For the cases we referred to (the villages of Tuzla and Sarighiol (today Albești)) it reached in some years (of the period 1881-1899) 80-90% of the total of the deaths (according to the situation from the civil state registers). The average of the above mentioned years was of 2267 excedent births, meaning 16‰. If we consider this annual average as corresponding to the entire period (without the years from the First World War and the Balkan Wars, 1916-1919, respectively 1911-1912, 7 years less than those 46 of the period) we reach the number of 88 413 (39x2267), population come from the natural excess. The absolute raise of the population of the county was of 164 942 inhabitants, it results that almost half of this growth was due to the migratory flux. These data are aproximative; we have to detail the annual evolution of the demographic growth of the period. Still, they offer us a perspective over the phenomenon of migrations of the period.

Globally, the good environment for these migrations was the urban one, since in 1899 the population of the towns of the county was 20.4% from the total, and in 1930 it was 32.5% (there is a contribution of the administrative reorganization after which a number of localities were declared towns; but its help is small). Religiously in 1899 the situation was: 68.3% Orthodox, 25% Muslims, 2.3% Roman-Catholics, 2.1% Protestants, 0.9% Lipoveans, 0.8% Mozaics, 0.6% Armenians. As citizens, they were: 63.28% Romanians, 19.5% Turks, 6% Greeks, 3.55% Austro-Hungarians, 2.3% Italians, 1.28% Bulgarians, 0.9% Germans. The citizenship does not represent the ethnic structure faithfully. Without going into detail this thing results from the comparison between the situation of the citizens and of the religious belonging. Overlapping in order to compare with the year 1930, the religious belongings and the residence we can state:

- The Orthodox population had a preference for the urban area (69.6% from the total of urban population; here we have to include the Romanians, the Bulgarians, the Greeks and the Russians as nationalities).
- The Jews preferred the towns (3.9% Mozaics in towns) and the Armenians (2% in towns).
- An opposite preference was showed by the Muslims (only 19.4% in towns to 25% of the population).

Danachioi (Stelu ȘERBAN, Ștefan DORONDEL, "L'histoire orale entre document et récit. Continuité et changement dans la société rurale de Roumanie", in Elena SIUPIUR [coord.], *Peuples, États et Nations dans le Sud Est de l'Europe*, Anima, București, 2004, pp. 45-82).

– The German minority (Roman-Catholics and Protestants) had a special situation, the Roman-Catholics preferred the towns (together with other faithful Catholics they represented 4.1% of the urban population) while the Protestants lived in the rural area. These interpretations are based on the data of the archive fund of the Evangelic Community in Constanța, to which we will refer further.

Starting from this context we selected the social units with a multiconfessional and multiethnic character in order to thorough our archive research at a microsocial level. According to the 1899 census there were seven rural communes in which three confessions/nationalities were in a relatively numeric balance (Cicrâci had even four such confessions: Orthodox, Protestants, Muslims, Lipovans), while in other 19 communes, two of these confessions lived together. The rest up to the 73 rural communes of the county were inhabited exclusively or majoritarily by the same confession. Not even in this case is the multiethnic character excluded, the Orthodox being Romanian or Bulgarian and the Muslims, Turks or Tartars. For the present moment we took as starting point of our research the seven communes above mentioned as having the highest ethnic and confessional dispersion.

The data from the civil state registers during the period 1881-1899 in the villages from Tuzla and Sarighiol (today Albești) show a continuously changing demographic situation¹. The great population movement in the three villages of Tuzla (hamlets as they were called at that time) is suggested by the extremely reduced number of marriages. At a population of 1456 people (502 Orthodox, 251 Roman-Catholics, 699 Muslims and 4 Protestants) and 307 nuclear families (in 1899) only 22 marriages were celebrated during the six years of the period, years for which there is available data (it is about the years 1881, 1884, 1888, 1890, 1891, 1894). 17 marriages were between people of Orthodox confession (Bulgarians, Romanian, Lipovans, Greeks, Albanian). The rest were made between Muslims. Many of the involved people were not born in Tuzla (20), although the majority declared living in that commune. In the case of seven marriages, one of the husbands lived in Tuzla, the other in another commune. As a result, even on this reduced basis of the statistics of marriages we can state that the matrimonial alliances were not the main way of access to the community.

More data is offered by the situation of the births. This way in 1881 9 new born babies are registered, four of whom in Orthodox families (the rest Muslims), in 1884 there are 41 new born babies (10 Orthodox, 31 Muslims), in 1888, 32 (13 Orthodox, 19 Muslims), in 1890, 25 new born babies (18 Orthodox, 7 Muslims) and in 1894 from the 18 births whose documents were kept (there were 64 births that year) in 5 the new born babies were in Orthodox families. It is quite difficult to precise the ethnic belonging of these people.

In the villages of Sarighiol commune, which were 7 in 1899 with a population of 1916 inhabitants (841 Orthodox, 315 Protestants and 760 Muslims) there wasn't any marriage for those three years for which there is archive data. In exchange the number of births is big, 35 in 1887 (7 in Orthodox families, 28 in Muslim families), 32 in 1888 (7 in Orthodox families, 25 in Muslim families), respectively 30 in 1889 (8 in Orthodox families, 22 in Muslim families). We have to notice the massive preponderance of Muslim families, as well as the total absence of the Germans (although the statistics of the Lutheran communities in Constanța offer a number

¹ To collect the data we used the Civil State Registers from the National Archives, Constanța.

of 183 believers in Sarighiol in 1892). On the other hand, the quasi absence of the Muslims (Turks and Tartars) is contradictory in the case of the marriages.

On one hand, the migratory phenomenon had a notable importance for the *land property distribution*. On the other hand, the latest situation was, as I said, strongly influenced by the intervention of the Romanian state in 1882. The final date of this process is considered the middle of the 1920s. This is because on the one hand the interwar agrarian reform, although juridically stated in 1921 was finished only at the end of the decade (the putting in possession) and on the other hand, in 1923 the government of Romania issued another law of "organization of Dobroudja", which completely changed the data of the problem.

The property distribution can accurately be reconstituted taking as a source of documentation the funds of the cadastre of Constanța county. We started this research studying the land property distribution in Tuzla and Cogealac, in the period 1882-1889. The property structure was relatively balanced, there were small properties (less than 5 ha), the middle and the big properties were consistent. A certain tendency of separating the land property on ethnic criteria can be also followed. In Tuzla, for example the members of the Romanian upper class society of the time bought big properties – the members of the families Costinescu, Kogălniceanu and Murgescu (24 persons totally), while the middle properties were bought by the Bulgarians (in this category we have to include also the people of Turkish or Tartar nationality, who owned properties as a result of their inheritance, but recognized by new documents by authorities). In Cogealac the big property was limited, but the middle property, bought or inherited (10-50 ha), was prevailing. In this case the biggest number of owners were of German origin.

To detail this situation we specify, in the case of Cogealac commune, the entering into possession between May-August 1883 of 22 Turkish-Tartar families resident in Iman Çișme hamlet. The total surface which made the object of this action was of 759 ha arable land. There is no mention about the common property of the village commons or forests. It's worth remembering the fact that from the 22 owners, 3 had their properties diminished or expropriated. As a result of this action big surfaces remained in individual property (the biggest of 63 ha). At the opposite pole the smallest property had 5 ha, while most of these owners had surfaces between 9 and 11 ha. After that a big part of these properties were sold directly by their owners to two persons in Babadag (100 ha), of Romanian nationality. The reorganization of the land property involved the sale of big surface of agricultural land, more than 1000 ha, by the Romanian state to a number of 45 people, most of them of Bulgarian nationality, in September 1889.

A similar evolution happened in Tuzla. Here the entering into possession was accompanied by the systematization of the settlement, together with the surfaces of arable land parceled in the boundary of the village, each family (42 recognized as having the right of property from the 54 existing) received 2000 square metres inside the village with the obligation of building their houses according to the plans made by the architects authorized by the Romanian state. In 1882 these owners received a surface of 854 ha. All the 42 owners were of Turkish-Tartar origin, and taking into account the data from civil state registers (births) the majority of them may have been established in the village for a short time. A year after this, because 26 families settled in the village, the parceling of the arable land of the village was repeated, admitting the right of property for a total of 52 families who were given a surface of 904 ha. The following year, on the basis of the reorganization of

the land, the rights of property resulted after the expropriations, the allotments, the entering into possession and the sales were constituted. The nominal situation of the owners shows that:

- From the 42 owners entered into possession in 1882, all of Turkish-Tartar nationality, 25 were expropriated a third of the surfaces, which became lands owned by the state.

- 10 families of the same nationality were allotted surfaces between 2 and 10 ha. 21 families were given land (10 Bulgarian, 7 Romanian and 4 Turkish-Tartar) in equal parts from a surface of 180 ha (100 depossessed from a certain Gabriela Cerchez and 80 from the state).

- A number of 14 owners (most of them Bulgarians) bought surfaces of 10 ha either from the existing owners, or from the Romanian state.

- 24 people, most of them Romanian, bought big properties (100 ha and more) the same way. Among them were members of the families Murgescu, Costinescu and Kogălniceanu.

The continuous changing of land owners led in 1889 to a new action of allotment, whose result was the recognizing of the property right of 74 owners with surfaces between 10 and 80 ha.

The theme of the present work, beyond its strictly historic character, is important as it sends us to research a vaster problem, the long term changing of the South-Eastern European regions on Danube Valley. In further projects we will show to what extent these regions had a similar evolution and where they differ. We take into account, at least for Dobroudja, the social and economic transformation after the integration in Romania, although it happened without a preestablished action programme and had profound effects. The ability of the local and colonized population to adjust to sudden changes and to take risks regarding its own biography mattered more. In this article we limited to the presentation of the general frame in which these modifications took place.

ANNEXES

Table 1

Statistics of the Population in Dobroudja in 1850

County	No. village	Caza	Number of families												Total
			Turkish	Tartar	Romanian	Bulgarian	Lipovan	Ukrainian	Greek	Gypsy	Arab	German	Armenian	Jew	
S I L I S T R A	9	Tulcea	105	–	1290	200	250	787	200	20	–	50	30	30	2962
	11	Isaccea	183	–	363	–	–	163	29	23	–	–	3	20	784
	18	Măcin	501	15	591	92	93	25	20	23	–	1	3	–	1364
	33	Hârșova	165	688	496	–	–	–	–	6	–	8	–	–	1363
	71	Baba	557	1075	674	871	40	117	1	100	–	–	40	69	3544
V A R N A	37	Chiustendje	352	442	242	26	364	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	1426
	36	Mangalia	405	5	–	5	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	415
	84	Balcic	620	–	–	482	–	–	–	–	2	–	–	–	1104
	89	Bazargic	1912	–	–	538	–	–	50	40	143	–	50	–	2733
Total	388		4800	2225	3656	2214	747	1092	300	212	145	59	126	119	15695

Source: Ion IONESCU DE LA BRAD, *Opere*, vol. II, cit., p. 104. As I noticed errors I corrected the numbers in the last column, respectively last line.

Table 2

The Size of the Village

	Tulcea	Isaccea	Măcin	Hârșova	Baba	Chiustendje	Mangalia	Balcic	Bazargic	Dobroudja
No. Families	2962	784	1364	1363	3544	1426	415	1104	2733	15695
No. Villages	9	11	18	33	71	37	36	84	89	388
Average no. families/village	329.11	71.27	75.77	41.30	49.91	38.54	11.52	13.14	30.70	40.45